

6
REMARKS

The following presentation is intended to comply with 37 CFR 1,111 (b) and 37 CFR 1,111 (c) and respond to rejection of the claimed invention as In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443,24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir.1992) as presented by the examiner.

1. Prior art, presented by the applicant, was intended to illustrate individual examples of features within the present invention, however these features were unintended be combined, as presented by the examiner.
2. Doubtless, if the elements are combined, the references would fall short of amended claim 1, within the present invention.
3. Prior art references cited, by the examiner, are vague and unclear or require translation, so these teachings lack motivation to be combined (expressed or implied) so as to produce results of the present invention.
4. Prior art references cited is deficient of any suggestion that modification will result in features claimed within amended claim 1 of the present invention.
5. Prior art references cited is individually complete and functional, so reason or motivation to employ parts, add or combine these teachings is lacking.
6. The combination of references, requiring a multiplicity of steps as indicated, is to complicated to be considered obvious.
7. The fact that multiple references must be combined to achieve results is evidence that the present invention is both novel and unobvious.
8. Key elements within prior art cited, by the examiner, have omitted, for example, the term "extractate".
9. Applicants invention, within the present application as amended, solves a problem different from a combination of teachings of the prior art. This result was established by judgment within In re Wright, 6 USPQ 2d 1959 (1988).
10. Consideration of a prior art search resulted in filling the present application and provides evidence that prior art was evaluated and determined to be inapplicable.
11. Regarding prior art references cited, by the examiner, this prior art was found to be groundless within the present application.